

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

VINCENT JOHNSON,	)	Civil Action No.: 4:12-390-RBH-TER
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
-vs-	)	
	)	<b>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</b>
	)	
PATRICK DONAHOE, SANDRA	)	
WILLIAMS, BEVERLY BROOKS,	)	
and PAUL CHRISTENSON,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

In this action, Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, asserts causes of action arising out of his employment with the United States Postal Service. Although not explicitly set forth, Plaintiff appears to assert claims of employment discrimination and retaliation in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII), 42 U.S.C. § 2000(e) et seq., as well as state law claims for slander and defamation. Presently before the court is Defendants Williams', Brooks' and Christenson's Motion to Dismiss (Document # 28).<sup>1</sup> In their Motion, these Defendants argue that dismissal of the claims against them is appropriate because they are not proper defendants in a Title VII claim, see, e.g., Lissau v. Southern Food Service, 159 F.3d 177, 180 (4th Cir. 1998) (holding that Title VII does not allow for individual liability), and because Plaintiff otherwise fails to state a claim against Defendants Williams, Brooks, or Christenson that is plausible on its face. In his Response (Document # 34) to the Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiff asserts "Please amend. I would like to exclude

---

<sup>1</sup>All pretrial proceedings in this case were referred to the undersigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and (B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(g), DSC. Because this is a dispositive motion, this Report and Recommendation is entered for review by the district judge.

Defendants Christensen, Brooks and Williams.” Thus, Plaintiff consents to the dismissal of these Defendants. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Motion to Dismiss (Document # 28) be granted and that Defendants Williams, Brooks and Christenson be dismissed from this action.

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III  
Thomas E. Rogers, III  
United States Magistrate Judge

January 4, 2013  
Florence, South Carolina

**The parties’ attention is directed to the important information on the following page.**